

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KENNETH JAMES WARGULA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-1300-pp

v.

MARTIN J. O'MALLEY,

Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED
WITHOUT PREPAYING FILING FEE (DKT. NO. 3)**

The plaintiff has filed a complaint seeking judicial review of a final administrative decision denying his claim for disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. Dkt. No. 1. He also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

Federal law requires a person who files a complaint in federal court to pay \$405—a filing fee of \$350 (28 U.S.C. §1914(a)) and a \$55 administrative fee (Judicial Conference of the United States District Court Miscellaneous Fee Schedule Effective the December 1, 2023, #14). To allow the plaintiff to proceed without prepaying the filing fee, the court first must decide whether the plaintiff can pay the fee; if not, it must determine whether the lawsuit is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§1915(a) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Based on the facts in the plaintiff's affidavit, the court concludes that he does not have the ability to pay the filing fee. The plaintiff indicates that he is

not employed, he is not married and he has no dependents he is responsible for supporting. Dkt. No. 3 at 1. The plaintiff lists no income; the only monthly expense listed is \$291 in other household expenses, which he says is paid by Foodshare. Id. at 3-4. The plaintiff says that he doesn't own a car or his home or any other property of value and that he has no cash on hand or in a checking or savings account. Id. at 3. The plaintiff states, "I don't have any income. I have free housing paid by the government and they give me foodshare for groceries." Id. at 4. The plaintiff has demonstrated that he cannot pay the \$405 fee.

The next step is to determine whether the case is frivolous. A case is frivolous if there is no arguable basis for relief either in law or in fact. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting Nietzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Casteel v. Pieschek, 3 F.3d 1050, 1056 (7th Cir. 1993)). A person may obtain district court review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. 42 U.S.C. §405(g). The district court must uphold the Commissioner's final decision as long as the Commissioner used the correct legal standards and the decision is supported by substantial evidence. See Roddy v. Astrue, 705 F.3d 631, 636 (7th Cir. 2013).


The plaintiff's complaint indicates that he applied for SSDI and SSI and received an unfavorable decision from an administrative law judge; the Appeals Council subsequently denied review. Dkt. No. 1 at 2. The plaintiff states that the ALJ's decision is not supported by substantial evidence, contains harmful errors of law and the ALJ abused his discretion. Id. At this early stage in the

case, and based on the information in the plaintiff's complaint, the court concludes that there may be a basis in law or in fact for the plaintiff's appeal of the Commissioner's decision, and that the appeal may have merit, as defined by 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The court **GRANTS** the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 15th day of October, 2024.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Pepper', written over a horizontal line.

HON. PAMELA PEPPER
Chief United States District Judge